



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/437,764	11/09/1999	LOUIS C. YUN	015685-032/5	8412

7590

06/18/2002

GREGORY D. CALDWELL  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BLVD  
SEVENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90024

EXAMINER

LOGSDON, JOSEPH B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2662

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/437,764

Applicant(s)

YUN ET AL.

Examiner

Joe Logsdon

Art Unit

2662

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 May 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 28 May 2002. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejections of claims 6-9 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).  
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.  
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: 6-9 and 15-18.Claim(s) rejected: 1-5, 10-14 and 19-23.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
9. ☒ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 12-14.  
10. ☐ Other: None.

HASSAN KIZOU

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the prior art does not apply because the "probing signal" of the prior art is not a "pilot signal" as recited in the claims. Brennan et al., however, reveals that a probe signal is, in a similar context to that of the claims, also a pilot signal (abstract; column 2, lines 43-51). Contrary to Applicant's interpretation, the context of Brennan et al. makes clear that "probe or pilot" implies that the same signal could be called either a probe signal or a pilot signal. Applicant's argument that a "probing signal" is not an "existing pilot signal" is irrelevant because the claims do not recite "existing pilot signal."

Applicant's argument that a pilot signal and a probing signal are necessarily different is unpersuasive-except in the field of CDMA. Page 8 of the specification describes the pilot signal with reference to the IS-95 standard, which is used only for illustrative purposes. Most of the claims, however, are not limited to CDMA.

The Admitted Prior Art has been withdrawn as prior art because it involves the IS-95 standard and therefore uses a definition for "pilot signal" that is inconsistent with that for "probe signal," as used in the references.

It should be noted, however, that Brennan et al. has nothing to do with CDMA. Furthermore, the last paragraph of Gerlach teaches away from the application of Gerlach to CDMA. It would therefore be helpful if some of the claims were amended to include the limitation that CDMA is used.